

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/990,574	Applicant(s) KAUMAYA ET AL.	
	Examiner ILIA OUSPENSKI	Art Unit 1644	

All Participants:

(1) ILIA OUSPENSKI.

(2) JOAN DREW.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102(b)

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Srinivasan et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Ilia Ouspenski
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner advised Applicant that the Declaration by Dr. Kaumaya, although sufficient to obviate the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of record, is not sufficient to obviate the issue of anticipation under 102(a). Applicant indicated that additional evidence would be provided in a timely manner..